

Copy Carton No 11

THE
SUBJECTS AND MODE
OF
Christian Baptism:
IN
TWO LECTURES.

BY
REV. A. A. CAMERON,
OTTAWA.



OTTAWA, CANADA :

JOSEPH LOVEDAY, PRINTER, 361 DALHOUSIE ST.

Bibliothèque du Séminaire de Québec

3, rue de l'Université,
Québec 4, QUE.

P R E F A C E .

THE following Lectures are published by special request. It has been made evident, from what transpired in Ottawa last winter, that among pedo-baptist communities there exists either ignorance or misunderstanding as to the position taken by Baptists on the Subjects and Mode of Christian Baptism. Hence the desire to publish these Lectures. Moreover, there is a notion very prevalent amongst a large class of pedo-baptists—and one which their teachers are not very solicitous to remove—that the distinctive views of Baptists in reference to baptism are not sustained by the great and learned of other denominations. A careful perusal of the quotations given will open the eyes of many on this matter. All is submitted in the interests of pure evangelical truth.

LECTURE I.



WHY WE DO NOT BAPTIZE OUR INFANTS.

"In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. But He answered and said, every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up" (Matt. xv. 9, 13).

CHRIST moved in society fulfilling the letter and the spirit of the Old Dispensation. While, however, He thus honoured God by keeping the law as none ever kept it before, He was under no obligation to be bound by the traditions of men; yea, He placed Himself in direct antagonism to such traditions. In the early part of this chapter we find Christ and the Pharisees in collision. He would not submit to the pharisaical ritualistic custom of washing His hands before eating. This gave them grievous offence. How did Christ reply? "Why do ye *transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?*.....But in vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men!" He thus makes a sharp distinction between what was of divine authority and what was of human divising. He offers no apology for taking issue with them on a point which He solemnly affirms was a mere traditional custom, and whose tendency was to make the commandment of God of none effect. On the other hand with all the earnestness of His nature He protests against the custom, and reminds the Pharisees, that before the march of pure spiritual religion, all these traditions must give way; "For" He adds, "every plant which my Father in heaven has not planted, shall be rooted up".

As Baptists we take exactly the same ground in our opposition to *infant sprinkling* as Christ took against the traditionary rites of the Pharisees. We believe it to be a mere human institution, having a strong influence in making New Testament baptism of none effect. This being a living conviction with us, you can understand our bold, unflinching opposition to it. It is to be remembered however that it is the *custom* we oppose, not those who practise it. Baptists have no unkind or unchristian feelings towards those who differ from them. But in reference to infant baptism, we have opposed it, we *do* oppose it, and will continue to oppose it. It is a part of our great mission in the world, to oppose it with all the zeal, intelligence, talents and powers with which God has endowed us.

My task this evening demands of me some *reasons* why we do not baptize our INFANTS. I say infants advisedly. Our position is often misstated and hence misapprehended by the affirmation that we advocate adult baptism, and oppose that of *children*! We do neither! We believe the scriptural subjects of baptism to be BELIEVERS, and believers ONLY! It matters not whether the believer be the veteran of eighty or the child of ten. But to our task:

(1) We do not baptize our infants, because *neither Christ nor any of His apostles sanctioned the baptism of any other class than that of BELIEVERS!* Observe (1) John the Baptist's preaching and baptism revealed Christianity in the bud. All those he baptized in Jordan, *confessed their sins!* (See Matt. iii. 1-12.) (2) Christ Himself was baptized to "fulfil all righteousness" when about thirty years of age (Matt. iii. 13-17). At His baptism the proclamation was made to all men, that Jesus of Nazareth, the carpenter's son, was to be esteemed no longer a mere man, but the Beloved Son of God in the nature of man. From the date of His baptism, therefore, the Jordan rolled forever between His former life as a *natural man*, and that glorious life in which He was henceforth to appear as the Incarnate Deity! So every believer in His baptism proclaims to the world, "The Divine dwells in me!" (3) The Commission authorizes *disciples* only to be bap-

tized. (See Matt. xxviii. 19.) All nations are not to be baptized, only that portion of them taught or made disciples of. (4) The practice of the *apostles* harmonizes with this teaching of the Commission—(see Acts ii. 41; v. 14; viii. 12, 26-38; ix. 18; x. 47; xviii. 8). The teaching of these texts is unmistakably clear and positive! But our pedo-baptist brethren argue in favour of infant baptism from the fact that "*whole households were baptized.*" The Scriptures make mention of the Jailer's, Stephanus', Crispus', and Lydia's households; and they add, "we cannot reasonably suppose that no little ones were in all these. We have here the principle of family baptism." Now when any person assumes that there were infants in these households, the burden of proof falls upon him who makes the assumption. It will not do in a great question of this kind, with so much positive evidence to the contrary, simply to say, "Is it likely there were no babies in so many households?" I cannot imagine a weaker ground on which to build such an institution as infant baptism, than that of mere **SUPPOSITION!** No court on earth, except a pedo-baptist church, would accept of such evidence! Pedo-baptist brethren, give us *facts*, not assumptions. If there were any babies in those households, tell us how many? Or, if you fail as to the exact number, just tell us of **ONE!** I will however oblige our pedo-baptist friends, by aiding them in the search for infants among the above households. Let us therefore, guided by the infallible Word, pay a friendly visit to those Christian families; if little ones are there we shall surely either see or hear them. We will make our first call at Lydia's house. (Acts xvi. 14, 15.) Let us look at the facts given us here. (1) Lydia is described as a certain *woman*; (2) she is a woman that earns her *own* living; (3) she is mentioned as the head of the household! (4) she is transacting business at Philippi, 300 miles from her home. From these facts, where is the evidence that Lydia was married, or that she had any children, or that any of them were infants? Does not the Scriptures affirm the husband to be the head of his wife, and hence of his household? but here we have a woman—supporting *herself*—the head of the household. And yet the assumptions of our pedo-baptist friends are that

she was married, had children, and that there were little ones among them!!* We next visit the Jailer's (Acts xvi. 30-34). What are the facts here? (1) The gospel was preached to *all* that were in his house (ver. 32); (2) *all* that were in his house BELIEVED (ver. 34); (3) all the believing household were BAPTIZED! We have here, in other words, (1) household instruction; (2) household faith; (3) household baptism! Our next visit is to the chief ruler's household, CRISPUS (Acts xviii. 3). Here again we have all the household BELIEVERS. "Well, well," then you say, "you cannot walk through Stephanus' house so easily. Paul simply says, 'And I baptized also the household of Stephanus' (1 Cor. i. 16); how can you prove that there were no infants there?" Patience, friend, "The law of the Lord is perfect, making wise the simple". The household of Stephanus turns up elsewhere. (See 1 Cor. xvi. 15.) "Ye know the HOUSE OF STEPHANUS, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that *they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints!*" Dr. McKnight has the following note on 1 Cor. i. 16—"The family of Stephanus seem all to have been adults when they were baptized, for they are said (1 Cor. xvi. 15) to have devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints!" We have thus examined, in the light of God's Word, those households on which our pedo-baptist friends build so much, and are unable to find one infant among them all. Yea, we have found that the evidence is conclusive in favour of believers' baptism in every case, unless we except Lydia's, while in her case the assumption is that she was not married at all! But were the evidence less clear, what would the household argument amount to? WHOLE households were baptized. If the children in those households were baptized, were they ALL baptized, or only the infants? Then at what age did the baptizing ceremony stop? Baptists baptize whole households to-day, but do pedo-baptists? How can intelligent Christian ministers, with the New Testament in their hand, stand up in the pulpit and affirm, with all the solemnity of conviction, that infants must have been in those households, when a simple examination of each case brings us to the inevit-

* Meyer thinks the other members of Lydia's household were female assistants in the business connected with her trade.

able conclusion that none are included in the term *household* but *believers*?

Children coming to Christ. Another argument in favour of infant baptism is built upon Matt. xix. 13-15. But it will be as difficult to find baptism in this passage as to find the infants in the others! Baptism is mentioned in conjunction with the households! but, to the confusion of our opponents, no little ones are there to be baptized. Little ones are mentioned in Matt. xix., but, to their still greater confusion, baptism is not there! But, unless they see the little ones baptized in some scripture, what folly to talk about them at all! But let us look at the text before us. Notice (1) when the children are coming, the apostles rebuked their parents. Now the apostles could not have known anything about infant baptism, else they would administer no rebuke. Infant baptism clearly was not known therefore up to this date, which brings us nearly to the close of Christ's ministry. But did it begin at this date? Were those children who came to Christ baptized? If so, then infant baptism has the authority of Christ to sanction it. If *not*, then this incident is the strongest possible evidence against the *custom*! Read and see if they were baptized. Christ took them in His arms and blessed them—but we do not read of them being baptized even after being *blessed*! Had Christ any intention of instituting such a rite as infant baptism, would He have missed such an opportunity? Christ's taking children in His arms and praying for them, is quite in harmony with His kind, tender and genial disposition. The scene is one we often see when a good man visits our home! Baptists bring their children to Christ—not to the font. We dedicate them to Him, ask Him to spare them to us and early bring them to a knowledge of His saving love! He who brings infant baptism out of the Saviour's blessing children, has a more fanciful imagination and subtle perception than Shakspeare!

The promise to you and your children (Acts ii. 39) is made to do duty in the pedit-baptist cause. Dr. Doddridge remarks, "The word in the original, *tekna*, rendered *children*, signifies *posterity*; and does not necessarily imply

infancy". Besides, the promise has no reference to baptism, but to the gift of the Holy Spirit. The main idea being that the blessings of grace are to ALL generations, "even unto as many as the Lord our God shall call".

But we are told that *we have no example of baptism being refused to infants!* Will our pedo-baptist brother be kind enough to give us a single instance of baptism being asked for a child? if he can, he can see the refusal in the very next verse!!

But a zealous advocate of this tradition strikes out in the following novel but very amusing argument:—"Before I refuse to baptize children, I must find a command like this—'Baptize all people, but leave out the children'"! Well, if this be good logic, the Roman Catholic priest may well say, "Before I refuse to baptize BELLS, I must see a command to leave out the *bells*". There is just as much scriptural authority to baptize bells as to baptize infants! But there is no such command in God's Word as to baptize *all people or nations*. The command is to preach the gospel to all nations, then those who are made *disciples* of are to be baptized.

So far therefore we have learned—

First, that every instance in which baptism is referred to in the New Testament, the *subject* was a BELIEVER; secondly, that the household argument has not even "the shadow of a shade of a ghost of a foundation" when carefully examined in the light of the inspired record; thirdly, that the text, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, &c.," is conclusive on two points: (1) That infant baptism was unknown to the apostles; (2) that Christ did not then institute infant baptism as the children went away from Christ without being baptized.

The following evidence from eminent Presbyterian and other divines, will doubtlessly startle many in Ottawa, who heard their ministers talk very depreciatingly of the Baptist position in reference to infant baptism:—

"The baptism of *infants* in the first two centuries after Christ was *altogether unknown*; but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. In the fifth and following ages it was generally received. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the *third* age after Christ

was born. In the former ages no trace of it appears. It was introduced without the command of Christ. . . . Therefore, this rite is observed by us as an *ancient* custom, but *not* as an apostolic tradition." (CURCELLAEUS, *Professor of Divinity of Geneva*.)

"None ought to be baptized but *visible disciples* of Christ; for in baptism there is an open acknowledgment of the party for a disciple of Christ. He ought to be looked upon as a servant of the great Master, before he get on his badge and wear his livery. The commission for baptizing runs so, *first* to 'make disciples', *then* to 'baptize' (Matt. xxviii. 19). And this is the very native order of these things. But none but visible believers can be acknowledged for Christ's disciples." (BOSTON, *Disputation of Right to Sacrament*.)

"It is impossible to deny that the general description which the *Shorter Catechism* gives of a sacrament teaches, by a plain implication, that the sacraments are intended *only for believers*, while no Protestants, except some of the Lutherans, have ever held that infants are capable of exercising faith. It also teaches by plain implication, in the previous question (the 91st) that the wholesome influence of the sacrament is experienced *only* by those who '*by faith received them*'. All this is applied equally to *baptism* and the Lord's Supper. Its general import as implying a virtual restriction of these ordinances to *believers* is too clear to be misunderstood, or to admit of being explained away." (REV. DR. WM. CUNNINGHAM, *Principal of New College, Edinburgh*.)

"Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants. There is absolutely not a *single trace* of it to be found in the New Testament. Some, indeed, have argued that in the silence of Scripture, it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is seen in the second century must have descended from the apostles; but the presumption is *wholly* the other way." (NORTH BRITISH REVIEW (*Pres.*), Aug. 1852. *Edited by* DR. HANNA.)

NEANDER, the great historian, and professor of church history in the University of Berlin—"Baptism at first was only administered to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. There does not appear to be any reason for deriving

infant baptism from any apostolical institution". (Church Hist., Vol. i. 430.)

Bishop BURNET—"There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for infant baptism." (*Pen.* p. 52.)

BAXTER—"I concluded that all examples of baptism in Scripture do mention only the administration of it, to the professors of saving faith." (*Disput. of Right to Sac.* p. 156.)

BOSTON—"There is no example of baptism recorded in the Scriptures where any were baptized, but such as appeared to have a saving interest in Christ." (*Works,* p. 384.)

CHARNOCK, the great Presbyterian divine on the cross—"God seals no more than He promises. He promises only to faith, and therefore seals to faith. Covenant graces therefore must be possessed, and acted, before covenant blessings be ratified to us." (*Works,* Vol. ii. 781.)

Bishop PRIDEAUX—"Pedo-baptism rests on no other divine right than Episcopacy." (*Pen.* p. 64.)

(2) We do not baptize our infants *because doing so would be contrary to the genius or spirit of the New Dispensation!* Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ. The letter predominated in the old, the Spirit in the new. To become entitled to the national privileges of Abraham one had only to be circumcised and keep the law. To become a sharer of the blessings of the covenant of grace one has to be born again; in other words, the privileges of Christ's kingdom are only to believers! The New Testament presents to us Christ, the Second Adam, the NEW MAN, as the central thought of theology! The second grand idea of this dispensation is that the CHURCH is the Body of Christ. The New Testament Church is therefore a spiritual community; in it there is no room for a membership based on a *mere ritual*. To this Body of Christ belong the ordinances of the new dispensation—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. To administer either of these ordinances to any but those who are members of Christ's Body by faith, is to ignore the very CONSTITUTION of the Christian Church. Those who found

infant baptism on circumcision as given to Abraham, mystify New Testament *teaching* by the fogs of Judaism! Abraham had two seeds, the natural and the spiritual; to the one an earthly inheritance was promised, to the other a spiritual. The natural seed received their inheritance in Canaan, and retained it 1,500 years, and might have retained it until now but for their rejection of the Lord Jesus Christ. But who are Abraham's spiritual seed? Let the apostle Paul answer: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed*, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii. 29). Dr. Scott—a pedo-baptist expositor—remarks, "The unbelieving descendants of Jacob were no more interested in the most valuable promises than the posterity of Ishmael and Esau were, while all *believers*, though of Gentile extraction, being one with Christ, were included in the Abrahamic covenant, without any concern in the Mosaic law, or the Sinai covenant" (*Com. on Gal. iii. 16*). As Rev. William Fraser puts, in replying to a pedo-baptist minister, "You claim the promise of the spiritual *seed* to the *natural offspring of believers*. This is more than Abraham himself could ever claim. We become children of Abraham not by the natural but by the *spiritual* birth. If I am a child by the spiritual, shall my son or daughter be so by the *natural* birth? A most deadly error, that has chloroformed millions to their eternal ruin".*

(3) Again, the SYMBOLISM of baptism furnishes sufficient reason why it should not be administered to any but BELIEVERS. Paul, in Rom. vi., teaches that baptism symbolizes our death, burial and resurrection with Christ. In baptism the old Adam life is symbolically buried, and the NEW-MAN life has a blessed resurrection! Dean Alford, Luther and others agree with this view. The *Shorter Catechism* declares, "baptism doth signify and seal our *ingrafting into Christ*, and our engagement to be the Lord's". When baptism is administered to an infant, what an incongruity to suppose its old life dead—that that child is now risen with Christ, or that it ~~seals its~~ ingrafting into Christ! Thus to administer baptism with

* "Reply to Rev. R. Rodgers' 'Lectures on Baptism,' in the Town of Collingwood." By Rev. William Fraser.



any *show* of consistency, one must be a believer in baptismal regeneration. Indeed it is a matter of history that infant baptism had its origin in the heretical notion that baptism regenerates! Either baptism does something for the child or it does not. Now, what *does it do for him?*—Wanted! a star-theologian, who will enlighten evangelical pedo-baptists on this point! One tells us he baptizes to remove original sin; a second, because the child has no sin! a third, because baptism regenerates; a fourth, because the parents are Christians; a fifth baptizes because he views it simply as a dedication of the child! Now, when pedo-baptists agree among themselves as to their reasons for baptizing children, it will be then an opportune time to ask us to follow their example! The very nature of the ordinance, and its scriptural definition, leave not a shadow of ground for administering it to any but believers. Baptism symbolizes great facts supposed to be realized in the *subject's* experience! When these facts are not true in reference to him, the rite is a solemn mockery, or at best a popish ceremony!

Lastly. We do not baptize our children, because we consider infant baptism a *positive evil*.

(1) It has a tendency to give the child in after life false views of his standing before God. He cannot get rid of the notion that *something* was done for him in baptism!

(2) Infant baptism introduces the *world into the Church*. The ecclesiastical system of which infant baptism is the centre, makes *mixed* membership possible and probable; hence, pure spiritual religion in pedo-baptist communities has to work not only against the world outside, but also that *inside* the visible church.

(3) Infant baptism is the pillar of popery. It is propagating religion by means of a sacrament, instead of by implanting the truth in the heart. This is the *BASIS* of the whole Roman system.

(4) Infant baptism bars millions of believers from obeying a positive command of their Saviour. The very first duty of the believer is to put on Christ by baptism! but his way to obedience is barred by his having been sprinkled as an infant. His heart may be glowing in the freshness of its first love, he may be earnestly seeking

for some self-denying act, in which he could show his allegiance to Him who died for him. To be buried with Christ by baptism into death would be just the act which God would accept; but then his parents stole a march on his faith and love, and got him sprinkled while yet a babe. "There being but one baptism he cannot be re-baptized." This is what his pastor tells him! If his convictions of truth lead him to break through the prejudices of a lifetime, and receive scriptural baptism and fellowship in a Baptist Church—he at once suffers all the reproaches of martyrdom. Talk about the charity and freedom of these times, when a man cannot carry out his convictions of truth without suffering persecution!

Believer in Jesus, hast thou been buried with Christ by baptism? Do not I beseech you allow your infant baptism (which is nothing as we have seen but a tradition of men) to render the command to you to be baptized, "of none effect". To every believer as well as to Paul, God addresses the command "*arise and be baptized*". If only sprinkled as an infant, you never were baptized! You never—as your own personal voluntary act—went down into the water and came up out of the water so as to be thus planted in the likeness of Christ's death, burial and resurrection! Before a foreigner is deemed a loyal subject of the kingdom of his adoption he takes the oath of allegiance. Baptism is the believer's oath of allegiance to Christ. "He that is baptized into Christ hath put on Christ!" That oath taken in your behalf before you came to the kingdom will not stand good, now that you are of age! God tells you in His Word that as a believer you *ought* to be baptized. Man tells you the few drops of water sprinkled on your face when an infant, will suffice. Whom are you to obey, God or man?

In conclusion, remember that our text predicts the downfall of infant baptism: "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." The heresy we are considering to-night has stuck its roots very deep; yet it shall be rooted out. Its growth even now is not by half so rank or luxuriant as of yore. Noble-minded men in all denomina-

tions are beginning to see how great a barrier it presents to the progress of pure and undefiled religion, and deplore its existence! It must be that as spiritual religion progresses, as that piety which has its roots in love for the TRUTH grows, that the foundation of infant baptism will become more and more insecure. Just as the inner life and spirit of truth are clearly seen and keenly appreciated will believers' baptism, as symbolical of these, be exalted to its primitive throne. As Christian men drink in more and more largely of the spirit and mission of the New Dispensation will Judaism and all fanciful analogies pertaining thereto grow dim and old, and the *newness* and freedom of the Church as the Body of CHRIST be exalted and prized! Amen.



y
o

P
b
o
a
b
re
ta
h
b
w
S
q

fu
ee
th
to
th
th
m
th

LECTURE II.



Why we do not Sprinkle when Baptizing, or the Scriptural Mode of Baptism.

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism (Eph. iv. 5). Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered *them* to you" (1 Cor. xi. 2).

PAUL found many faults with the brethren in Corinth, but for one thing he praises them; they were keeping the ordinances as they were delivered unto them. By ordinances here is meant whatever the apostle communicated by tongue or pen—*i.e.*, by word of mouth or letter—relative to faith or practice. Thess. ⁱⁱ. 15 is a commentary on this text: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or by our epistle." In our modern phraseology we apply the term *ordinances* to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The latter are included in the Scripture just quoted as well as in the text.

Now as a denomination we claim—rightfully or wrongfully—to have preserved the ordinances, as Christ delivered them and as the apostles practised them. Paul affirms there is but "one baptism", that one baptism we profess to hold, and my task this evening is to prove that the only mode of Scripture baptism is the *immersion* of the believer in water, in the Name of the Trinity. It may materially help to clear those mists which so often dim the vision on this question, to show that the baptism

commanded in the New Testament, is an ordinance belonging exclusively to the New Dispensation, in other words that it is an institution of Christ the Head of the Church.

It does not concern us to-night whether for not the Jews had their proselytes ceremonially washed; or whether Christ did not make use of a custom already known, and gave it a new force or meaning. Suppose that the most important clauses of the Canadian Shipping Bill, were transferred in their entirety to a Bill introduced to the English House of Commons; if such a Bill passes it becomes as truly an Imperial Statute as though it *originated* in either of the British Houses of Parliament. It is well to observe however that the profoundest scholarship of the age is against the supposition of proselyte baptism. Christ Himself affirms as much as that the baptism of John came from Heaven. The great question remains: did Christ institute the baptism of the New Testament Church, and is this baptism one which He expects all His faithful followers to submit to in that *form* which He Himself gave as an example?

Our *first* position then is, that the baptism commanded in the New Testament is an institution of Christ.

(1) Observe, baptism was such a distinctive part of John's mission, that he was known as THE BAPTIST. He came to prepare the way before the Anointed of the Lord. His ministry therefore was a magnificent preface to the greater one of *reconciliation*. John coming preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, not only foreshadowed *regeneration* or the new birth, but also indicated that baptism, as a symbolical ordinance, was to occupy a most prominent and significant position in the New Dispensation just about to be inaugurated.

(2) Christ Himself submitting to be baptized at the very time when His *natural* life as the Nazarene was to be buried forever in the glory of the DIVINE MAN, only confirms our position that baptism is the duty of all believers if they are to have the Lord Jesus Christ as their Great Example.

(3) The disciples were all baptized, for observe (1) John baptized all his disciples (See John iv. 1); (2) Jesus

baptized all His new disciples (same text). Christ's first disciples were chosen from John's, then as He made disciples He baptized them. (See John i. 35-51) We have thus Christ's practice.

(4) We have Christ's Commission to His apostles, first to make disciples, then to baptize them.

(5) We have the universal practice of the apostles, as illustrated in the Acts. They baptized ALL believers.

Our second position is, that baptism as instituted of Christ was the IMMERSION of the believer in water, in the Name of the Trinity. (1) The terms baptism and baptize are not translations from the Greek, but the Greek words with an English termination. The verb used under the direction of the Holy Spirit to describe the New Testament ordinance is *Baptizein*. Now although the rite is mentioned a great many times in the New Testament, no other verb, but *baptizein* is used. The meaning of this verb and its cognates, should determine the mode of baptism. Turning to the vocabulary of Greenfield's American edition of the Polymicrian Greek Testament, under the verb *bapto*, I find the definitions "to dip, to plunge, to dye". Under *baptizo* (from *bapto*), "to immerse, submerge, sink; in New Testament, to wash, cleanse, to immerse, administer the rite of baptism, &c." Turning to "Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament", published by the London Tract Society, and used as a text-book by students under the Ottawa Presbytery, it gives as the first meaning of *bapto*, "to dip", under *baptizo* it says, "(in form a frequentative of *bapto*), (1) mid. to bathe oneself, (2) to baptize, (3) figure of overwhelming woe".

Now if the root *bapto* means to dip, how can the emphatic form *baptizo* be made to mean, to sprinkle or to pour? Liddle & Scott's Standard Greek Lexicon defines *baptizo* as "to dip, to plunge, to immerse". Now if this Greek verb does not mean to immerse, the Greek vocabulary does not furnish one which does. There is a verb which clearly means to sprinkle, *rantizo*; another which means simply to wash or cleanse, *louo*; and yet another which means to pour, *keo* or *cheo*. Now how comes it that never in a single instance do we find any one of these three verbs used, interchangeably with *baptizo* in describing the Christian rite now under consideration.

We are told sprinkling is a mode of baptism. Yet the Greek verb which means to sprinkle, is never used in describing it, but one is used which in all Greek literature never means to sprinkle. We are told pouring is a mode of baptism, yet *keo* is never used in reference to this rite. The Commission reads, Go ye therefore and teach [disciple] all nations "*baptizontes*" [immersing] them, etc. And yet we are told sprinkling is a mode of baptizing, in other words that sprinkling is another way of immersing! which is absurd. Just suppose I announced this evening that so many believers were to be immersed next Sunday evening, what would you think of one who would still persist that I meant they were to be sprinkled? yet the position of the advocates of sprinkling is not less amusing. The Greek plainly reads, "*to immerse*" yet our pedo-baptist friends go all over the world saying, Oh, well, it means to sprinkle!! Our opponents will allow that the Greeks know their own language better than any of us. Now it is a notorious fact that the Greek Church universally immerse unto this day. Were any other Greek word so twisted, contorted, tortured, and made to mean ideas so diametrically opposed to one another, as *baptizo* has been, you could make the New Testament say, light is darkness and darkness light. We always understood our pedo-baptist friends believed in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. How therefore on this theory can they explain the Holy Spirit selecting *baptizo* from the Greek vocabulary instead of *rantizo*?

The testimony of the following distinguished authorities leaves not even a *doubt* as to what was the apostolic mode of baptism:—

"From these words (John iii. 23), it may be inferred that baptism was administered by John and Christ, by *plunging* the whole body *under water*. Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients; for they *immersed* the whole body *in water*." (CALVIN on John iii. 23; Acts viii. 28).

"'Buried with Him by baptism.' In this phrase the apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptism, which was to *dip* the parties baptized, and as it were to *bury* them *under the water* for a while and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up, to represent the burial

of our old man, and our resurrection to newness of life." (WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES, *consisting of fifty eminent ministers*, ANNOT. on Rom. vi. 4.)

"The word *baptizo*, to baptize, both in sacred authors and classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. It is always construed suitable to this meaning. Thus it is, 'in the water,' 'in Jordan.' The whole phraseology, in regard to this ceremony, concurs in evincing the same thing. The baptized are said to ascend *out of* the water, (Matt. iii. 16; Acts viii. 39). It is to be regretted that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer." (DR. GEORGE CAMPBELL, *Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen, on Matt. iii. 11.*)

"The original meaning of the word *baptism* is *immersion*; and though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of administration in the apostle's days was by an *actual submerging* of the whole body under water." (DR. CHALMERS on Rom. vi. 4.)

"Christ submitted to be baptized; that is to be *buried under the water* by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of His future death and resurrection. In like manner, the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial and resurrection." (McKNIGHT on Rom. vi. 4.)

LUTHER—"Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated *immersion*—as when we immerse something in water, that it may be wholly covered." Again he says, "Being moved by this reason I would have those that are to be baptized, to be altogether dipped into the water, as the word doth sound and the mystery both signify." (Hinton, p. 52.)

DR. BREWSTER of the Free Church—"Baptism in the apostolic age was performed by immersion." (*Edin. Encyc. Art. Baptism.*)

WHITFIELD—"It is certain that in the words of our text (Rom. vi. 3, 4), there is an allusion to their manner of baptism which was by immersion, which is what our own church allows." (*Eighteen Ser.*, p. 297.)

JOHN WESLEY—"Buried with Him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." (*Notes on Rom. vi. 3, 4.*)

(2) Let any candid intelligent Christian man read for himself (John iii. 16-17), the inspired account of Christ's baptism; also Acts viii. 38-39, where we have the record of the baptism of the Eunuch by Philip, with such passages as John iii. 22-23; Rom. vi., and can he come to any other conclusion than that the apostolic mode of administering the ordinance was by *immersion*!

(3) The symbolism of baptism demands immersion as the only mode of administration. The death and resurrection of Christ lie at the very foundation of the Christian system. Interest in the death and resurrection of the Redeemer constitutes the very substance and joyousness of the believer's hope. Now in going down into the water, and being buried in it, and in coming up out of the water [rising again], the believer symbolizes his death, burial and resurrection WITH CHRIST (See Rom. vi.). A believer immersed therefore tells those who witness the ordinance: (1) That by nature he is a sinner unclean, but now his sins are washed away in the blood of Jesus Christ, so that his old Adam life is reckoned crucified and buried forever; (2) That faith in Christ has given him a NEW LIFE, viz., the resurrection life of the glorified Christ. Now does either sprinkling or pouring symbolize these grand facts, in a believer's experience? What analogy is there between sprinkling or pouring and a burial? Can it be said that sprinkling some ashes or dust on the face of a corpse would be a burial? if not why should the sprinkling of a few drops of water on the face of a child be called a burial with Christ? Moreover what "old" or "new" life can be predicated of an infant that it may be said that he has symbolically buried the one, or given resurrection to the other?

Many puerile objections have been urged against immersion as a mode of baptism, foremost among these is the assertion that the three thousand converted on the day of Pentecost could not be immersed by the twelve in one day. To this we reply, (1) it is not necessary to suppose the three thousand were baptized the same day that they were converted, (2) nor that there were only

twelve to baptize them. The twelve could immerse the three thousand however in one day. There would be only two hundred and fifty candidates for each, giving two minutes for each candidate, the two hundred and fifty could be immersed in about eight hours. But there were $70+12=82$ who could baptize, which would only give 36 to each. The whole three thousand could thus be immersed within twenty minutes! But supposing for argument sake the three thousand could not have been immersed in one day, the question arises could they be sprinkled? It is as much the pedo-baptist's duty to find time to sprinkle the three thousand, as it is for us to find time to immerse them. I have seen many a child sprinkled, and I am satisfied the ceremony was TWICE as long as an *immersion*!

But we are further informed that there was not sufficient water in Jerusalem to immerse the three thousand! In other words a city capable of accommodating at times 2,000,000 of people was not able to provide water sufficient to immerse three thousand! To what straits are the advocates of sprinkling driven when they condescend to such a paltry style of reasoning as the above. Will our pedo-baptist friends, with all their pretensions to literary lore, ignore the fact, that Jerusalem has from time immemorial been known as the City of Baths and Fountains? The mere school-boy need not be told of some fountains in Jerusalem (see John v. 1). Have our pedo-baptist friends forgotten all about the Pool of Siloam thirty three feet long and eighteen broad! or the Fountain of the Virgin connected with it, fifteen feet long and six broad? Then there was the Fountain of *Gihon* where Solomon received his anointing for his kingdom. Greater than all was the royal cistern under the temple—a veritable lake—where hundreds could be simultaneously *immersed*! Strabo thus describes Jerusalem: “a rocky well-enclosed fortress *within WELL WATERED*, but without wholly dry.” Dr. Robertson says: “The main dependence of Jerusalem for water at the present day is on its cisterns, this has possibly always been the case. I have already spoken of the immense cisterns now and anciently existing within the area of the temple. Almost every house in Jerusalem of any size is understood to

have at least one or more cisterns excavated in the soft lime-stone rock on which the city was built!

But it has been urged that immersion is altogether unsuitable to our climate. Parts of Russia have the coldest climate in the world. St. Petersburg is 60° N. Lat., while Ottawa is only a little more than 45°, yet all the members of the Imperial Family of Russia are immersed! Baptism is only to be administered once, and if one does not possess sufficient spiritual warmth to enable him to symbolize his death unto sin and resurrection unto holiness, he is knocking at the wrong door when he seeks admission into the Church of which Christ is the Head.

Again, some have the unholy boldness to affirm "immersion is an indelicate act!" "Evil be to him that evil thinks." He who can detect any indelicacy in the act of burying a brother or a sister with Christ by baptism has an impure heart and an evil eye. Avaunt with such profanity as to sneer at an ordinance instituted by Him who endured the cross, despising the SHAME.

We have thus seen that baptism by immersion is an institution of Christ, and that His apostles faithfully administered it to all believers. It now remains to be shown that *believers' immersion as a law of Christ* is of PERPETUAL obligation! He who instituted the rite of immersion alone can change it. It takes the same power that legislates to repeal. Christ legislated, "Go ye, and make disciples of all nations, immersing (*baptizantes*) them, etc., and, lo, I am with you alway to the END of the WORLD. Amen!" The law of baptism was to be a statute in the Church for ever. If Christ has repealed it, when? No, Christ could not change it, for the Commission states it is to be of perpetual obligation, but Rome who defies so many of the laws of Christ, CHANGED it.

Listen to the candid testimony of DR. STANLEY, professor of Church History at Oxford. You will find it in his *History of the Eastern Church*: "There can no question, that the original form of baptism, the very meaning of the word, was complete immersion in deep baptismal waters, and that for at least four centuries, any

other form was either unknown or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case." To this form the Eastern Church, still rigidly adheres, and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially valid! Stanley then proceeds: "The Latin Church, changed the mode of baptism on its own authority, without even attempting to plead the teaching of Scripture, or primitive usages; and that now the only witness for the scriptural mode of baptism among Romanists, is the Church at Milan; and among Protestants, the Baptists!" and yet with such evidence as this on our side, men calling themselves learned, will hold us up to ridicule for practising immersion. We find Protestant ministers, working themselves up to an extraordinary zeal in denouncing the traditions of Rome, while all the time there may be seen flapping about their own garments, some of the very first rags that Babylon wore!

"But the quantity of water used in baptism is of no importance," continue our pedo-baptist friends. We reply, Christ must have thought immersion essential to the obedience of His NEW LAW, else He would not have commanded it. Why should men therefore persist in putting their carnal reasonings in opposition to a positive institution of Him who is infinite in wisdom? My officer tells me to take a red flag, and hoist it as a signal on a pole. I in my superior wisdom think a white flag, with a few red spots will do equally well! What will my officer think of me for thus betraying a sacred trust? Am I not guilty of a gross and deliberate act of disobedience unworthy of a soldier? God gave the Christian Church *immersion* as a banner around which all believers could show their allegiance to the Great Captain of their salvation. This allegiance Baptists faithfully yield, but what a poor show of loyalty pedo-baptist regiments exhibit in hoisting that miserable unscriptural substitute, infant sprinkling! I have spoken plainly, but faithfully, on this question. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Let no sophistry mislead you from "Thus saith the Lord." You are responsible to God to possess an enlightened conscience on this question. Kindly let me ask you two questions: (1) art thou a believer? With-

out faith ordinances can avail you nothing. (2) If a believer, have you been baptized? Remember your being sprinkled as an infant was no obedience on *your* part to a command only addressed in God's Word to believers. Go then, believer, seek the consecrated grave along the path He trod. May the Holy Spirit help you to respond, "Yes, Lord," and

"Should it rend some fond connection,
Should I suffer shame and loss,
Yet the fragrant, blest reflection—
I have been where Jesus was—
Will revive me
When I faint beneath the *Cross*."

